



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LITERARY YANKEEPHOBIA IN HISPANIC AMERICA

*By J. Fred Rippy, Ph.D., in charge of Latin American History,
University of Chicago*

(Concluded)

6. Carlos Pereyra

Professor Carlos Pereyra has devoted a great deal of time to the presentation of the North American peril and most of his works have had to do with the Monroe Doctrine and Anglo-American imperialism. From these *The Monroe Doctrine, Manifest Destiny, and Imperialism*, and *The Legend of Monroe* may be taken as illustrating his attitude.⁴⁸

In the former he declares that the Monroe Doctrine is not an obligatory law for the United States, but the personal opinion of the president in a particular case; that its true meaning was revealed by the refusal of the government of the United States to become an unreserved participator in the Congress of Panama (1826) and its assertion at the time that it preferred to see Cuba and Porto Rico remain subject to Spain;⁴⁹ that the doctrine has served only as the handmaid of manifest destiny, having been invoked only when the prospect of national aggrandizement was apparent;⁵⁰ that the *Big Stick* policy of Roosevelt, in effect, divided the states of Hispanic America into three categories: those which are capable of maintaining order, and which, accordingly, are not likely to be interfered with in the immediate future; those which are incapable of leading an autonomous and progressive life and which must therefore

⁴⁸ *La Doctrina de Monroe, el Destino Manifesto y el Imperialismo* (Mexico, J. Ballezá y Cía., 1908); *El Mito de Monroe* (Madrid, Editorial-América [1914?]).

⁴⁹ Pages 35-36.

⁵⁰ Pages 56-118.

accept the tutelage of the United States; and those "which unfortunately possess . . . territory coveted by the United States."⁵¹

In *The Legend of Monroe*, Pereyra develops much more fully the topics outlined in his earlier work and presents new evidence. For present purposes the general tendency and scope of this book may be illustrated by a few brief quotations and a statement of its grand divisions and some of its chapter headings. The author begins by the assertion that there is not one Monroe Doctrine, but at least three:

The first . . . is that which the Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams wrote and which, incorporated by Monroe in his message of December 2, 1823, was immediately buried in the most complete forgetfulness, if not in its terms, at least in its original significance, and which . . . is only known as a relic laboriously restored by certain investigators for a small group of the curious.

The second . . . is that which, as a legendary and popular transformation, has advanced from the text of Monroe to a species of diffuse dogma and of glorification of the United States, to take final form in the report presented to President Grant by Secretary of State Fish, July 14, 1870; in the report of Secretary of State Bayard, dated January 20, 1887, and in the instructions of Secretary of State Olney to the Ambassador in London, Bayard, of June 20, 1895.

The third Monroe Doctrine is that which, taking as a foundation the affirmations of these public men and their brazen falsifications of the original doctrine of Monroe, seeks to represent the foreign policy of the United States as an ideal derivation from the original Monroeism. This last form of Monroeism, which, unlike the previous one, is indeed not a falsification but a super-impregnation, has as authors the representatives of the imperialist movement, McKinley, Roosevelt, and Lodge; the representative of dollar diplomacy, Taft; and the representative of the tutelar, imperialistic, financial, biblical mission, Wilson.⁵²

Pereyra declares that the Monroe Doctrine is the American diplomatic superstition which must be studied as one studies the superstitions of Polynesia, for instance. Or better, since the words of Monroe have been made to constitute a "formula of mystic value for conjuring interna-

⁵¹ Page 118 ff.

⁵² *El Mito de Monroe*, pp. 11-12.

tional dangers more or less imaginary," it may be considered a sort of taboo.⁵³

Having thus presented his thesis, the Mexican professor proceeds to develop it under four main heads: The Initial Historical Error, Partial and Total Eclipses of Monroe, In the Paths of Imposture, Monroeism Running and Grinding at all Events.

In the first division of his work he employs such catchy chapter headings as "Monroeism considered as a superfluity by Monroe himself," "The Holy Alliance Monroeist before Monroe," "Monroe says his money is counterfeit, and no one believes him," "Calhoun removes the curtain of mysticism from Monroe," in order to set forth his opinion that the promulgation of the Monroe Doctrine did not prevent the Holy Alliance from interfering in South America for the simple reason that this alliance had already decided not to intervene before December 2, 1823; and that there was nothing benevolent or unselfish about the Monroe declaration.⁵⁴ In the second main division of his work the author cites twenty-one instances where the doctrine was applied, or should have been applied, and concludes that the taboo is only invoked when the selfish interests of the United States can be served thereby.⁵⁵ Under the heading of "In the Paths of Imposture," he calls Fish, Bayard, Olney, and Blaine the "four apostles of the two cardinal virtues of Monroeism, i.e., hypocrisy and apprehensiveness;" dwells upon Captain Mahan's arguments in favor of North American imperialism; and declares that the British navy is at the service of Monroeism as Monroeism is at the service of British commerce.⁵⁶ The last division of Pereyra's book is devoted to a study of the recent imperialistic career of the United States (1895-), and here again appear such interesting titles as "35,000 square kilometers of Monroeism at the mouths of the Orinoco," "The scalp of Doctor Drago," "President Wilson adds the

⁵³ Pages 13-20.

⁵⁴ Pages 27-123.

⁵⁵ Pages 127-209.

⁵⁶ Pages 213-238.

salt of Monroeism to the Lodge Resolution," "Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan coins money with the effigy of Monroe," "The Master work of Mr. Knox."⁵⁷

7. *Gonzalo G. Travesí*

The attitude and labors of the numerous authors of lesser caliber may be illustrated by the productions of the Mexican journalist, Gonzalo G. Travesí; of the Central American student and author, Salvador R. Merlos; and of the prolific Colombian *littérateur* and radical, José Maria Vargas Vila.

Travesí declares in his *The Mexican Revolution and Yankee Imperialism* that the Monroe Doctrine has resulted in great misfortunes for Hispanic America because it has served as a pretext to cloak imperialistic designs. Whenever the North American republic has desired to enlarge its boundaries and influence, it has pretended that in the republics to the south neutrality was being infringed, intervention, open or dissimulated, was being threatened, or armed attack was impending. Cuba, Porto Rico, Santo Domingo, Venezuela, Central America, Mexico, and the Philippines ought to be faithful witnesses to the varied constructions to which it has been possible to subject the doctrine. Mexico owes to the doctrine, among other things, the loss of Texas, the disastrous war which followed, the fall of Lerdo de Tejada and of Porfirio Diaz, and the anarchy which has recently afflicted the republic.⁵⁸

Travesí believes that Yankee imperialism has grown up under the shadow of the Monroe Doctrine and that the United States will continue to be imperialistic so long as it is under the control of the oligarchy of big business. And so long as this condition continues, Mexico will be in danger—Mexico will be in danger because Anglo-American big business desires to exploit her magnificent natural resources.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Pages 240-463.

⁵⁸ *La Revolución de Mexico y el Imperialismo Yanqui* (Barcelona, Casa Editorial Maucci, 1914), pp. 162-165.

⁵⁹ Pages 211 ff.

But there are other factors which render Mexico's situation perilous. The motives which moved the United States to construct the Panama canal were political and militaristic, rather than economic. The United States desired to control the Caribbean and the Pacific. But the Tehuantepec Railroad which runs across Mexican soil would endanger this sway if it should remain in the hands of British citizens. Petroleum has not only economic but also military value. An oil-burning navy would be much more efficient than one which burns coal. The fabulously productive oil wells of Mexico, placed at the service of another power, might prove fatal to the North American navy.⁶⁰

It is in the light of these facts that the author wishes Hispanic America to view the events which have led to the occupation of Vera Cruz (1914). The imperialists of the United States desire to gain possession of Mexico's oil, her natural resources, her strategic route from sea to sea, and it is of little importance whether the pretext is an insult to the flag or something else.⁶¹

Then, referring to the debarkation of Yankee troops which had just taken place, he cleverly seeks to generalize the danger: "The work has begun; it has begun in the Mexican ports, and perchance it will continue with devastating force over the rest of the New Continent. Tomorrow the North American eagles will take their flight toward the South Yankee imperialism has already humiliated Spain, the old and exhausted mother of the people of the continent of Columbus. Already it has planted its fangs in the soil of Mexico. . . . " If the North Americans should desire to seize other lands toward the south, they will not "hesitate to shoot down women and children as they have done in Mexico, as they have done in Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines " ⁶²

⁶⁰ Pages 167-210.

⁶¹ Pages 197, 210, 219-220.

⁶² Pages 252-254.

8. *Salvador R. Merlos*

Merlos has described the motives and content of his book, *Latin America before the Peril*, in a somewhat striking fashion:

This book is the narration of the imperialistic machinations which have placed us in the state in which we find ourselves; it is a denunciation of the vileness of which we have been the object, of the nefarious offences which have been committed against us; it is the unburdening of an indignant heart by the writing of true and just words; it is the anathemization of the spurious sons who have shamelessly sold the soil of their country; it is a call to the Nicaraguan people to procure the fulfillment of their rights which are being trampled under foot; it is an explanation to the people of Europe regarding the content of Monroeism; it is an exposition of what is felt and thought south of the Rio Bravo, [published] with the view that Mr. Wilson may be led to choose between continental peace and an open struggle between two races; it is an excitation to the fulfillment of duty; it is right against force, protest against violence.⁶³

It can be seen from this passage that while the author's animus arises mainly from the procedure of the United States in Central America, he seeks to convey the idea that the peril is general. This phase of the matter becomes more evident in the following eloquent passage:

There is for the people of Latin America a grave danger which no one ignores and which all the world witnesses with marked indignation: Yankee Imperialism. This imperialism is somewhat like an infuriated sea which threatens to inundate our green fields and to extinguish the fire of our Plutonic volcanoes; it is similar to a tempestuous wind which threatens to tumble down the great edifice of our republican institutions and bury beneath its ruins the heroic actions and the name of the race. To draw attention to it is a duty; to fight in order to detain it is a necessity.⁶⁴

Unlike some of the anti-Yankee school, Merlos does not believe that the United States has always been ruthless and egotistic. This disposition of the Anglo-Saxon republic represents a sad and striking deterioration from a former state of grandeur. "The never-to-be-forgotten civic doctrines which, with all the grandness of his soul,

⁶³ *América Latina ante el Peligro*, pp. 15-16.

⁶⁴ Page 28.

George Washington taught the people he had emancipated" have given way with astounding rapidity to others which are the "complete antithesis of the former." The North American fathers placed a high value upon liberty and declared that all men deserved to be free; the North American imperialists have so far departed from this state of mind as to impose despotisms upon the weaker states of Hispanic America. "The worthy founders of American independence and the men who, as Lincoln, have been faithful interpreters of justice and of right would not be able to survive in a medium infected by the miseries of such filibusterism"; McKinley, Roosevelt, that "barbarous hunter of wild beasts and peoples," and Taft, the "Attila of modern times," would be for them "incomprehensible nightmares."⁶⁵

In harmony with this line of thought, he is willing to admit that the Monroe Doctrine, at the time of its promulgation, served as a protection to the struggling Spanish American states, but he does not admit that Monroe gave them their independence. This he refuses to do because he thinks the Hispanic Americans would have been able to resist the projected invasion of the Holy Alliance and because they could have counted upon the assistance of England.

Merlos contends that the Monroe Doctrine has served its time, however, and he gives a rather full statement of the reasons why Hispanic America cannot afford to accept it: The nations of Europe are not likely to attempt conquests in a region where they have such strong commercial, and—in the case of France, Spain, and Italy—racial, and cultural ties; their resources and the spirit of solidarity which exists there would enable the Hispanic American states to defend themselves; Europe would be deeply offended at the prospect of an America united under a doctrine created exclusively against it, and rivalry and war on a huge scale would be the result; there are racial bonds which unite Latin America to Spain, Portugal, France, and Italy, which

⁶⁵ Page 30 ff.

ought not to be sundered; strong migratory, commercial, industrial, scientific, artistic, and literary currents running between Europe and Hispanic America might be dammed up by the acceptance of the doctrine; and, finally, even if the declaration should free the states south of the Rio Grande from a possible European attack, it would leave them at the mercy of the United States and in a condition of perpetual tutelage and vassalage.⁶⁶

The Central American writer gives a concise and rather clever explanation for the prevalence of the imperialistic impulse in the United States. The North American people are young, vigorous, and enterprising. These characteristics applied to a very favorable physical environment have accomplished astounding commercial, industrial, and scientific development. Abounding energy and unusual success have resulted in arrogance and conceit; many of the Yankees consider the Latin Americans as little better than the red men whom they have exterminated. If to these factors are added the demand for markets produced by the expanding commerce of the United States—a demand which the Yankees prefer to supply by conquest rather than by open competition—and military and strategic needs which call for elements of war, appropriate supplies, coaling stations, naval bases, and control over Panama, Nicaragua, and possibly all between the Rio Grande and these countries, the result will be a sum total of imperialistic tendencies truly formidable.⁶⁷

Having thus rejected the Monroe Doctrine and explained Anglo-American imperialism, Merlos proceeds to delineate the crimes of that imperialism. The main emphasis is placed upon the interference of the United States in Central America and the secession of Panama, but the author finds occasion to object strenuously to the subjection of Santo Domingo, Porto Rico, and Cuba, and to the haughty meddling of the United States in the internal affairs of other Latin American republics. Not once does he see the possibility that the United States might be moved by benevolent

⁶⁶ Pages 69–105.

⁶⁷ Pages 47–68.

motives, such as a desire to assist the turbulent republics to achieve financial and political stability, or to save them from undue pressure from Europe—always there is present Yankee vanity which finds satisfaction in playing the supervisory rôle, or Yankee greed solely interested in pecuniary considerations.⁶⁸

But Merlos is not a pessimist with regard to the future of Hispanic America. "From Mexico to the Argentine . . . a wave of pure Latin-Americanism delights our spirit. A cloud of noble rebelliousness seems to extend itself over all the peoples of Hispanic America. The multitudes begin to become conscious of themselves and of the brilliant future which awaits us if we know how to direct ourselves with ability. Everywhere is heard voices of alarm let loose in the presence of the enemy, and everywhere is being considered the union of the coveted peoples."⁶⁹ And for an awakened people the means of defense are at hand. They are, in brief, internal improvements of all kinds; a methodical exploitation of natural resources; the cementing of solidarity between the states of Spanish and Portuguese origin by means of closer trade relationship, the interchange of professors, officials, labor delegates, and students, the calling of frequent congresses, and the establishment of an organized system of centers for the cultivation and promotion of Latin Americanism; approximation with the peoples of Europe, particularly those of Latin descent; a vigorous campaign for immigrants; and freedom from economic dependence upon the United States.⁷⁰

9. *José María Vargas Vila*

The most violent of all the anti-Yankee group in the countries to the south has been saved until the last. José María Vargas Vila, of Colombia, is a radical and a revolutionist by nature, and he has spent a good portion of his life in exile. He lived during the five years subsequent to 1893 in New York; he afterwards spent considerable time in

⁶⁸ Pages 106-216.

⁶⁹ Page 245.

⁷⁰ Pages 363-397.

Europe, but in 1903, he returned to the North American metropolis where he began the publication of an abusive review entitled *Némesis*. His attacks upon the Washington government with reference to the Panama episode soon led to the suspension of his periodical, and he returned once more to Europe, there to carry on his anti-Yankee propaganda and, perhaps incidentally, to engage in the production of pure literature. He has a method of punctuation and of capitalization, and a style all his own.⁷¹ The excerpts which are given below must therefore necessarily represent a very free rendition of his Spanish.

As may be conjectured, Vargas Vila has written a great deal in denunciation of the United States.⁷² Most of his productions are of a similar nature, however, and he says of his recent book, to which he has given the somewhat inscrutable but striking title, *Before the Barbarians (the United States and the War) the Yankee; Behold the Enemy*, that "it synthesizes and condenses twenty-five years of verbal battle at the feet of the same ideal; twenty-five years of prophesying upon these same walls already half destroyed and in part occupied . . . by the barbarians."⁷³ He has designed this work as his master stroke, therefore, and it will not be necessary to go elsewhere to find materials illustrating his attitude.

He introduces this violent production in the following forceful manner:

Now when the spectres of Tyre, of Babylon, of Ninevah, arise along the horizon fuming and crackling, full of the deep voice of thunder and the terrifying splendor of the flame; now when Louvaine, Reims, and Amiens revive the horror of distant conflagrations undertaken by the barbarians in the far off days of history; now when the thinkers and lonely prophets of modern times declare while looking towards the towers and palaces of Berlin and Potsdam: *Troy, too, will see its last day*; now when

⁷¹ A brief biographical sketch of Vargas Vila and an incomplete list of his works will be found in his *La Demencia de Job* (Madrid, Antonio Rubinos, 1916), p. 169 ff.

⁷² Most of his works may be obtained from Zabala and Maurin, 135 West 49th Street, New York City.

⁷³ *Ante los Barbaros (los Estados Unidos y la Guerra) el Yanki; he ahí el Enemy* (Barcelona, Casa Editorial Maucci, [1917?], p. 25.

before the noisy crash of civilization the world knows not but to weep and die amid its ruins; now when the Hell of Death blinds the eyes of Humanity and prevents them from looking towards life; who will relate to burning Europe the sorrows and agony of Latin America which is being assaulted and violated by a horde of barbarians no less greedy, no less cruel, than those who at the call of the implacable voice of destiny came forth from the solitudes of the Black Forest with the design of pillaging and ruining the world? Who will tell the Latin civilization threatened with death in Europe of the Golgotha of the Latin race soon to disappear in America?

Here, too, the *Odisea* of barbarism advances ominously. Here the conquest advances, but treacherously and silently as the waters of a flood in the night—advances with the same characteristics of inexorable violence and assassinating fury as that which devastates the plains of Picardy and the fields of Flanders and Brabant. Here, too, the people are destroyed upon the altars of their gods and the ashes of their hearths. Here, too, Justice is violated and Right (*Derecho*) has no other refuge than the arms of death. . . . Here the chargers of despotism stamp over virgin fields which are not their own and the world does not feel the impact of the hordes of Alaric marching . . . in the Latin mountains, nor observe the course of the vessels of the pirates of the North who navigate with their eyes fixed on the stars of the South.⁷⁴

According to Vargas Vila the Yankees began their frightfulness in the Philippines (Evidently he suffered from a temporary lapse of memory! Did it not begin in Mexico?). After the debauched white volunteers and the semi-savage Negroes swept over the islands the "silence of horror held sway in the barren archipelago where, in the name of civilization, a people drunk with avarice . . . eclipsed the cruelty of the Tartars and the frightfulness of the Assyrian conquests." Cuba was the next victim, and then followed others in rapid succession.⁷⁵

Along with the terrible violence goes a profound deceitfulness. "They raise the cry of liberty over Cuba, over the Philippines, over Porto Rico, and they make them their own. They announce themselves as the sons of Washington and they are the filibusters of Walker. They have fallen upon the people as the foot of an elephant (*paquidermo*) and crushed their hearts." Cuba, Porto Rico, Dominica, Nicaragua, Panama, "strangled by the friendly hand of the

⁷⁴ Pages 12 ff.

⁷⁵ Pages 47-48.

republicans of the North, agonize in their arms," and the Philippine republic perishes, choked with the blood of its sons.⁷⁶

This infuriated Colombian does not think the expansion of the United States ought to be dignified by the appellation of imperialism. "Let us not speak of Yankee *Imperialism*. *Imperialism* does not exist in America; there exists only *Filibusterism*." A comparison of the expansionist policy of England and the United States will serve to bring out the distinction. "English imperialism is a violent system; Yankee filibusterism is a bloody diletantism. English imperialism is the design of a people; Yankee filibusterism is the sport of savages: . . . the one is the imperialism of a race, the other the vandalism of a tribe. English imperialism civilizes: India, enormous and prosperous; and Egypt, Australia, Canada, rich and virtually free, are witnesses to the fact. American filibusterism brutalizes the Filipinos, hunted as wild beasts; the vanished Hawaiians; the despoiled Panamanians; the Porto Ricans, obliged to emigrate because of misery, are witnesses."⁷⁷

To Vargas Vila the Monroe Doctrine is a dangerous weapon in the hands of an assassin, and he has no patience with Pan-Americanism. "The Monroe Doctrine is the jawbone of an ass brandished in the hands of Cain."⁷⁸ "The single word Pan-Americanism sets my hair on end. . . . Everything makes the men of the races of South America not the allies, but the natural adversaries of the race and the peoples of the North."⁷⁹ He therefore advocates Hispanic American solidarity. "It is necessary to unite against the Yankee. It is necessary that from Mexico to Cape Horn there shall be a single brain to combat him, a single arm to resist him, a single heart to hate him." He also urges the "union of these countries with the mother country," and "approximation to Italy and to France, the two greatest daughters of the race."⁸⁰

⁷⁶ Pages 59-60.

⁷⁷ Pages 158-160.

⁷⁸ Page 192.

⁷⁹ Pages 183-187.

⁸⁰ Pages 86-88, 112-116, 143.

III. CONCLUDING ESTIMATE AND OBSERVATIONS

This brief analysis of some of the recent productions of the Hispanic American intellectuals which have a political bearing should be sufficient to reveal the nature of their complaints and fears. The views of some of them, as, for instance, Vargas Vila and Blanco Fombona, may have been influenced by unfortunate personal experiences in the United States. Most of them have perhaps placed too much weight upon the assertions of the Europeans and of the Anglo-American expansionist and imperialistic group. But their viewpoint has been shaped, in part also, by historical occurrences. Texas, New Mexico, California, all the southwestern portion of the United States, which once belonged to Mexico are now in the hands of the Yankees. This cannot be denied. Since 1898 the United States has acquired numerous widely scattered outlying possessions, has established some four or five protectorates, has acquired exclusive control of the important oceanic routes, has in short entered upon an imperialistic career. This is likewise undeniable. With regard to the motives for this expansion and this imperialism there is much room for differences of opinion, and only painstaking research and an intensely judicious attitude can determine the truth in the matter. Unfortunately the artistic temperament is most unlikely to subject itself to this ordeal.

Was there a deliberate conspiracy between the government of the United States and its citizens to rob Mexico of Texas? Was the war of 1846-1848 forced upon Mexico by the United States for the purpose of acquiring coveted territory? The writers whose works have been examined in this paper think so—and their conviction may be supported by the assertions of the political party in the United States which was opposed to the annexation of Texas and the Mexican War—but it would be difficult for them to put their finger upon one bit of evidence coming from those who were actors in this drama which would justify this view of the matter.

Was the Spanish-American War deliberately fomented by the United States in order that Cuba might be seized?

Have protectorates been established in the Antilles and Central America in order to satisfy North American greed for territory and to secure safe and profitable investments for the Yankee plutocrats? It would be foolish to maintain that the documents are now available to establish the truth in regard to these questions. One's opinion in such matters is likely to depend upon personal prejudices and the state of his digestive organs.

Did Roosevelt deliberately foment and support the Panamanian revolution in order to acquire the canal zone? Circumstantial evidence makes out a rather strong case against him, but the evidence, it must be remembered, is only circumstantial; and if it were shown beyond reasonable doubt that he did, would this one instance be sufficient to establish the real motives of the American policy of the United States, past, present, and future?

Has there ever been a time in their history when the majority, or a controlling minority, of the people of the United States deliberately sought to enlarge the boundaries of their country at the expense of their neighbors? In seeking to determine this question due allowance should be made for the Yankee's tendency to exaggerate when he speaks of the greatness and the destiny of his country. If such an attitude has existed, was it—or could it have been—more than temporary? In other words, can one assume that the existence of a given impulse at a given time within a given generation justifies the placing of that impulse among the permanent attributes of a people? Are the factors which create the imperialistic impulse fundamental and constant, or merely occasional and temporary?

Has the United States government deliberately sought an empire during the last two decades, or has that empire been gradually forced upon it by such external circumstances as the financial and political incapacity of certain Hispanic American states and the disposition of certain European powers to assume an aggressive attitude toward them? Would not the North American government willingly free itself, if it dared, from the whole troublesome, expensive, and perhaps thankless task?

If all these queries should be answered in a fashion most adverse to the United States, there are two or three other questions which should be considered. Are the small Hispanic American states who are anxious to exercise the glorious privilege of self-definition sure that self-definition is possible in the present world order? If the absolute sovereignty of small states should prove to be an international fiction, is it to them a matter of indifference who acts as their mandatory and perhaps their champion? Are there other large powers which they would chose as godfathers in preference to the United States, and would such powers be willing under the circumstances to accept the charge?

It should be remarked, in conclusion, that all the intellectuals of Hispanic America cannot be classed with the anti-Yankee group. Alejandro Álvarez, the famous Chilean internationalist; Manoel de Oliveira Lima, the distinguished Brazilian statesman and historian; Javier Prado, the Peruvian educator; and Fernando Ortiz and F. Caraballo y Sotolongo, Cuban intellectuals and writers of some note, may be mentioned among the friends of the United States. On the other hand, Yankeephobia is not confined entirely to the literati, as is evinced, for instance, by the attitude of the late ex-President Roque Sáenz Peña, of the Argentine, and Marcial Martínez, of Chile. It would, of course, be difficult to determine the strength of the opposition to and the fear of the United States in Hispanic America. This would necessarily vary with the times and circumstances, but the attitude is certainly more prevalent among the intellectuals. So far as the people of the United States are concerned, it is of considerable importance to know that this bitterness and suspicion exists; that an offence to one of the Latin American states is likely to be resented by them all; that an attitude of indifference and unnecessary rudeness is likely to drive their southern nations into the arms of Europe, thus creating a situation which, to say the very least, might have considerable gravity in the event of a crisis.